

Thiago M. Coelho, SBN 324715
thiago@wilshirelawfirm.com
Binyamin I. Manoucheri, SBN 336468
binyamin@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Daniel Cervantes
and Proposed Class*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANIEL CERVANTES, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

TAMARINE RESTAURANT, a California
company; and DOES 1 to 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1. VIOLATIONS OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12181
2. VIOLATIONS OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE § 51

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Daniel Cervantes (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action based upon personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts, and as to all other matters upon information and belief, based upon, *inter alia*, the investigations of their attorneys.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Plaintiff is a visually impaired and legally blind individual who requires screen-reading software to read website content using his computer. Plaintiff uses the terms “blind” or “visually impaired” to refer to all people with visual impairments who meet the legal definition of blindness in that they have a visual acuity with correction of less than or equal to 20 x 200. Some blind people who meet this definition have limited vision. Others have no vision.

2. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of those similarly situated persons (hereafter “Class Members”) brings this Class Action to secure redress against Defendant Tamarine Restaurant (hereafter “Defendant”), and DOES 1-10, for its failure to design, construct, maintain, and operate its website to be fully and equally accessible to and independently usable by Plaintiff and other blind or visually impaired individuals. Defendant’s denial of full and equal access to its website, and therefore denial of its products and services offered thereby and in conjunction with its physical location, is a violation of Plaintiff’s rights under the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) and California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act (“UCRA”).

3. Because Defendant’s website, <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/> (the “website” or “Defendant’s website”), is not fully or equally accessible to blind and visually impaired consumers in violation of the ADA, Plaintiff seeks a permanent injunction to cause a change in Defendant’s corporate policies, practices, and procedures so that Defendant’s website will become and remain accessible to Plaintiff and other blind and visually impaired consumers.

THE PARTIES

4. Plaintiff, at all times relevant and as alleged herein, is a resident of California, County of Sacramento. Plaintiff is a legally blind, visually impaired, handicapped person, and a member of a protected class of individuals under the ADA, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12102(1)-(2), and the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§ 36.101 *et seq.*

5. Defendant is a California company with its headquarters in Palo Alto, California. Defendant’s servers for the website are in the United States. Defendant conducts a large amount of its business in California and the United States as a whole. Defendant’s restaurant constitutes a place of public accommodation. Defendant’s restaurant provides to the public important goods and services. Defendant’s website provides consumers access to Defendant’s interpretation of modern Vietnamese cuisine in a sophisticated contrast of textures and exotic flavors that lead to a journey of the senses. Consumers can access information regarding Defendant’s menu, private dining, catering, reservations, ability to order online, ability to order delivery, gift cards, news & events, gallery, privacy policy, term and conditions, Defendant’s social media webpages and much more.

1 11. This Court also has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28
2 U.S.C. § 1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12181, as Plaintiff's claims arise under Title III of the ADA, 42
3 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.*, and 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

4 12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it conducts and
5 continues to conduct a substantial and significant amount of business in the State of California,
6 County of Sacramento, and because Defendant's offending website is available across California.

7 13. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391
8 because Plaintiff resides in this District, Defendant conducts and continues to conduct a
9 substantial and significant amount of business in this District, Defendant is subject to personal
10 jurisdiction in this District, and a substantial portion of the conduct complained of herein occurred
11 in this District.

12 14. Defendant owns, operates and maintains a brick-and-mortar restaurant location in
13 the State of California. Defendant's restaurant offers goods and services to the public. Defendant
14 also offers goods and services that are offered in Defendant's places of public accommodations
15 to the public through the website. Defendant's brick-and-mortar restaurant location and website
16 are integrated and are public accommodations pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7).

17 **THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AND THE INTERNET**

18 15. The Internet has become a significant source of information, a portal, and a tool
19 for conducting business, doing everyday activities such as shopping, learning, banking,
20 researching, as well as many other activities for sighted, blind, and visually impaired persons
21 alike.

22 16. In today's tech-savvy world, blind and visually impaired people have the ability to
23 access websites using keyboards in conjunction with screen access software that vocalizes the
24 visual information found on a computer screen. This technology is known as screen-reading
25 software. Screen-reading software is currently the only method a blind or visually impaired
26 person may use to independently access the internet. Unless websites are designed to be read by
27 screen-reading software, blind and visually impaired persons are unable to fully access websites,
28 and the information, products, and services contained thereon.

1 17. Blind and visually impaired users of Windows operating system-enabled
2 computers and devices have several screen-reading software programs available to them. Some
3 of these programs are available for purchase and other programs are available without the user
4 having to purchase the program separately. Job Access With Speech, otherwise known as
5 “JAWS,” is currently the most popular, separately purchased and downloaded screen-reading
6 software program available for a Windows computer.

7 18. For screen-reading software to function, the information on a website must be
8 capable of being rendered into text. If the website content is not capable of being rendered into
9 text, the blind or visually impaired user is unable to access the same content available to sighted
10 users.

11 19. The international website standards organization, the World Wide Web
12 Consortium, known throughout the world as W3C, has published Success Criteria for version 2.1
13 of the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (“WCAG 2.1” hereinafter). WCAG 2.1 are well-
14 established guidelines for making websites accessible to blind and visually impaired people.
15 These guidelines are adopted, implemented, and followed by most large business entities who
16 want to ensure their websites are accessible to users of screen-reading software programs.
17 Though WCAG 2.1 has not been formally adopted as the standard for making websites accessible,
18 it is one of, if not the most, valuable resource for companies to operate, maintain, and provide a
19 website that is accessible under the ADA to the public.

20 20. Within this context, the Ninth Circuit has recognized the viability of ADA claims
21 against commercial website owners/operators with regard to the accessibility of such websites.
22 *Robles v. Domino’s Pizza, LLC*, 913 F.3d 898, 906-06 (9th Cir. 2019), *cert. denied*, 140 S.Ct.
23 122, 206 L. Ed. 2d 41 (2019). This is in addition to the numerous courts that have already
24 recognized such application.

25 21. Each of Defendant’s violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act is likewise
26 a violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Indeed, the Unruh Civil Rights Act provides that any
27 violation of the ADA constitutes a violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Cal. Civ. Code §
28 51(f).

22. Further, Defendant's actions and inactions denied Plaintiff full and equal access to their accommodations, facilities, and services. A substantial motivating reason for Defendant to deny Plaintiff access was the perception of Plaintiff's disability. Defendant's denial of Plaintiff's accessibility was a substantial motivating reason for Defendant's conduct. Plaintiff was harmed due to Defendant's conduct. Defendant's actions and inactions were a substantial factor in causing the lack of access to Plaintiff. Unruh Civil Rights Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 51.

23. Inaccessible or otherwise non-compliant websites pose significant access barriers to blind and visually impaired persons. Common barriers encountered by blind and visually impaired persons include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. A text equivalent for every non-text element is not provided;
- b. Title frames with text are not provided for identification and navigation;
- c. Equivalent text is not provided when using scripts;
- d. Forms with the same information and functionality as for sighted persons are not provided;
- e. Information about the meaning and structure of content is not conveyed by more than the visual presentation of content;
- f. Text cannot be resized without assistive technology up to 200 percent without loss of content or functionality;
- g. If the content enforces a time limit, the user is not able to extend, adjust or disable it;
- h. Web pages do not have titles that describe the topic or purpose;
- i. The purpose of each link cannot be determined from the link text alone or from the link text and its programmatically determined link context;
- j. One or more keyboard operable user interface lacks a mode of operation where the keyboard focus indicator is discernible;
- k. The default human language of each web page cannot be programmatically determined;
- l. When a component receives focus, it may initiate a change in context;

- m. Changing the setting of a user interface component may automatically cause a change of context where the user has not been advised before using the component;
- n. Labels or instructions are not provided when content requires user input;
- o. In content which is implemented by using markup languages, elements do not have complete start and end tags, elements are not nested according to their specifications, elements may contain duplicate attributes and/or any IDs are not unique;
- p. Inaccessible Portable Document Format (PDFs); and
- q. The name and role of all User Interface elements cannot be programmatically determined; items that can be set by the user cannot be programmatically set; and/or notification of changes to these items is not available to user agents, including assistive technology.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

24. Defendant offers the <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/> website to the public. The website offers features which should allow all consumers to access the goods and services which Defendant offers in connection with its physical locations. The goods and services offered by Defendant include but are not limited to Defendant's menu, which includes items such as starters, soups, salads, noodles, entrees, vegetable sides, rice and desserts. Consumers can also access information on the website regarding private dining with private menus, catering, reservations, ability to order online, ability to order delivery, gift cards, news & events, gallery, privacy policy, term and conditions, Defendant's social media webpages, and much more

25. Based on information and belief, it is Defendant's policy and practice to deny Plaintiff, along with other blind or visually impaired users, access to Defendant's website, and to therefore specifically deny the goods and services that are offered and integrated within Defendant's restaurant. Due to Defendant's failure and refusal to remove access barriers on its website, Plaintiff and other visually impaired persons have been and are still being denied equal and full access to Defendant's restaurant and the numerous goods, services, and benefits offered

1 to the public through Defendant's website.

2 **DEFENDANT'S BARRIERS ON UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, CAL. CIV. CODE §**
 3 **51(f) DENY PLAINTIFF AND CLASS MEMBERS' ACCESS**

4 26. Plaintiff is a visually impaired and legally blind person, who cannot use a computer
 5 without the assistance of screen-reading software. However, Plaintiff is a proficient user of the
 6 JAWS or NV ACCESS screen-reader(s) as well as Mac's VoiceOver and uses it to access the
 7 internet. Plaintiff has visited <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/> on several separate occasions
 8 using the JAWS and/or VoiceOver screen-readers.

9 27. During Plaintiff's numerous visits to Defendant's website, Plaintiff encountered
 10 multiple access barriers which denied Plaintiff full and equal access to the facilities, goods, and
 11 services offered to the public and made available to the public on Defendant's website. Due to
 12 the widespread access barriers Plaintiff and Class Members encountered on Defendant's website,
 13 Plaintiff and Class Members have been deterred, on a regular basis, from accessing Defendant's
 14 website. Similarly, the access barriers Plaintiff has encountered on Defendant's website have
 15 deterred Plaintiff and Class Members from visiting Defendant's physical location.

16 28. While attempting to navigate Defendant's website, Plaintiff and Class Members
 17 encountered multiple accessibility barriers for blind or visually impaired people that include, but
 18 are not limited to, the following:

- 19 a. Lack of Alternative Text ("alt-text"), or a text equivalent. Alt-text is invisible
 20 code embedded beneath a graphic or image on a website that is read to a user
 21 by a screen-reader. For graphics or images to be fully accessible for screen-
 22 reader users, it requires that alt-text be coded with each graphic or image so
 23 that screen-reading software can speak the alt-text to describe the graphic or
 24 image where a sighted user would just see the graphic or image. Alt-text does
 25 not change the visual presentation, but instead a text box shows when the
 26 cursor hovers over the graphic or image. The lack of alt-text on graphics and
 27 images prevents screen-readers from accurately vocalizing a description of the
 28 image or graphic;

- b. Empty Links that contain No Text causing the function or purpose of the link to not be presented to the user. This can introduce confusion for keyboard and screen-reader users;
- c. Redundant Links where adjacent links go to the same URL address which results in additional navigation and repetition for keyboard and screen-reader users; and
- d. Linked Images missing alt-text, which causes problems if an image within a link does not contain any descriptive text and that image does not have alt-text. A screen reader then has no content to present the user as to the function of the link, including information or links for and contained in PDFs.

29. Recently in 2022, Plaintiff attempted to do business with Defendant on Defendant's website and Plaintiff encountered barriers to access.

30. Despite past and recent attempts to do business with Defendant on its website, the numerous access barriers contained on the website and encountered by Plaintiff, have denied Plaintiff full and equal access to Defendant's website. Plaintiff and Class Members, as a result of the barriers on Defendant's website, continues to be deterred from accessing Defendant's website. Likewise, based on the numerous access barriers Plaintiff and Class Members have been deterred and impeded from the full and equal enjoyment of goods and services offered in Defendant's restaurant and from making purchases at such physical location.

**DEFENDANT'S WEBSITE HAS A SUFFICIENT NEXUS TO DEFENDANT'S
RESTAURANT LOCATION TO SUBJECT THE WEBSITE TO THE
REQUIREMENTS OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT**

31. In the Ninth Circuit a denial of equal access to a website can support an ADA claim if the denial has prevented or impeded a visually impaired plaintiff from equal access to, or enjoyment of, the goods and services offered at the defendant's physical facilities. *See Martinez v. San Diego County Credit Union*, 50 Cal. App. 5th, 1048, 1063 (2020) (citing *Robles v. Domino's Pizza, LLC*, 913 F.3d 898, 905-06 (9th Cir. 2019)).

32. Defendant's website is subject to the ADA because the goods and services offered

1 on the website are an extension of the goods and services offered in Defendant's brick-and-mortar
2 restaurant. For example, the goods and the services which can be procured online are available
3 for purchase in Defendant's brick-and-mortar restaurant. Thus, since the Website "facilitate[s]
4 access to the goods and services of a place of public accommodation", the website falls within
5 the protection of the ADA because the website "connects customers to the goods and services of
6 [Defendant's] physical" restaurant. *Id.* at 905.

7 33. Defendant's website is replete with barriers, including but not limited to buttons
8 and links that do not interact with Plaintiff's screen reader, which impede Plaintiff and Class
9 Members from accessing the goods and services of Defendant's website. For example, Plaintiff
10 who desired to order food online, encountered a menu link that did not work. Additionally, after
11 several attempts, Plaintiff was unable to complete a reservation online via Defendant's website.
12 When buttons or links do not interface with screen readers, visually impaired users are not able
13 to select the buttons or links, making such buttons or links unusable for users who rely on screen-
14 readers, like Plaintiff. If Defendant had sufficiently coded the buttons and links on its website to
15 interact with screen readers, Plaintiff and Class Members would have been able to navigate the
16 webpage and complete a purchase as a sighted individual could.

17 34. Accordingly, Plaintiff was denied the ability to browse Defendant's website
18 enough to obtain sufficient information about Defendant's menu items, reservations procedure or
19 merchandise for sale in order to make a purchase because Defendant failed to have the proper
20 procedures in place to ensure that content uploaded to the website contained the proper coding to
21 convey the meaning and structure of the website, and the goods and services provided by
22 Defendant.

23 **DEFENDANT MUST REMOVE BARRIERS TO ITS WEBSITE**

24 35. Due to the inaccessibility of the Defendant's website, blind and visually impaired
25 customers such as Plaintiff, who need screen-readers, cannot fully and equally use or enjoy the
26 facilities and services Defendant offers to the public on its website. The access barriers Plaintiff
27 has encountered have caused a denial of Plaintiff's full and equal access in the past and now deter
28 Plaintiff on a regular basis from accessing the website.

36. These access barriers on Defendant's website have deterred Plaintiff from enjoying the goods and services of Defendant's brick-and-mortar restaurant which are offered through Defendant's website, in a full and equal manner to sighted individuals. Plaintiff and Class Members did intend to visit the Defendant's location in the near future had Plaintiff and Class Members been able to access Defendant's website fully and equally.

37. If the website were equally accessible to all, Plaintiff and Class Members could independently navigate the website and complete a desired transaction, as sighted individuals do.

38. Plaintiff, through Plaintiff's attempts to use the website, has actual knowledge of the access barriers that make these services inaccessible and independently unusable by blind and visually impaired people.

39. Because simple compliance with WCAG 2.1 would provide Plaintiff and Class Members with equal access to the website, Plaintiff and Class Members allege that Defendant engaged in acts of intentional discrimination, including, but not limited to, the following policies or practices: constructing and maintaining a website that is inaccessible to visually impaired individuals, including Plaintiff and Class Members; failing to construct and maintain a website that is sufficiently intuitive so as to be equally accessible to visually impaired individuals, including Plaintiff and Class Members; and failing to take actions to correct these access barriers in the face of substantial harm and discrimination to blind and visually impaired consumers, such as Plaintiff and Class Members, as a member of a protected class.

40. The Defendant uses standards, criteria or methods of administration that have the effect of discriminating or perpetuating the discrimination against others, as alleged herein.

41. The ADA expressly contemplates the injunctive relief that Plaintiff seeks in this action. In relevant part, the ADA requires:

In the case of violations of ... this title, injunctive relief shall include an order to alter facilities to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities Where appropriate, injunctive relief shall also include requiring the ... modification of a policy 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2).

42. Because Defendant's website has never been equally accessible, and because Defendant lacks a corporate policy that is reasonably calculated to cause the Defendant's website

1 to become and remain accessible, Plaintiff invokes 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and seeks a
2 permanent injunction requiring the Defendant to retain a qualified consultant acceptable to
3 Plaintiff to assist Defendant to comply with WCAG 2.1 guidelines for Defendant's website. The
4 website must be accessible for individuals with disabilities who use desktop computers, laptops,
5 tablets, and smartphones. Plaintiff and Class Members seek that this permanent injunction require
6 Defendant to cooperate with the agreed-upon consultant to: train Defendant's employees and
7 agents who develop the website on accessibility compliance under the WCAG 2.1 guidelines;
8 regularly check the accessibility of the website under the WCAG 2.1 guidelines; regularly test
9 user accessibility by blind or vision-impaired persons to ensure that the Defendant's website
10 complies under the WCAG 2.1 guidelines; and develop an accessibility policy that is clearly
11 disclosed on the Defendant's website, with contact information for users to report accessibility-
12 related problems and require that any third-party vendors who participate on the Defendant's
13 website to be fully accessible to the disabled by conforming with WCAG 2.1.

14 43. If Defendant's website were accessible, Plaintiff and Class Members could
15 independently access information about the services offered and goods available for online
16 purchase.

17 44. Although Defendant may currently have centralized policies regarding
18 maintaining and operating Defendant's website, Defendant lacks a plan and policy reasonably
19 calculated to make Defendant's website fully and equally accessible to, and independently usable
20 by, blind and other visually impaired consumers.

21 45. Defendant has, upon information and belief, invested substantial sums in
22 developing and maintaining Defendant's website, and Defendant has generated significant
23 revenue from Defendant's website. These amounts are far greater than the associated cost of
24 making Defendant's website equally accessible to visually impaired customers.

25 46. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff and Class Members will continue to be unable
26 to independently use Defendant's website, violating their rights.

27 ///

28 ///

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

47. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, seeks to certify a Nationwide Class under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(2), the Nationwide Class is initially defined as follows:

all legally blind individuals who have attempted to access Defendant's website by the use of a screen reading software during the applicable limitations period up to and including final judgment in this action.

48. The California Class is initially defined as follows:
all legally blind individuals in the State of California who have attempted to access Defendant's website by the use of a screen reading software during the applicable limitations period up to and including final judgment in this action.

49. Excluded from each of the above Classes is Defendant, including any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest, is a parent or subsidiary, or which is controlled by Defendant, as well as the officers, directors, affiliates, legal representatives, heirs, predecessors, successors, and assigns of Defendant. Also excluded are the judge and court personnel in this case and any members of their immediate families. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the Class definitions if discovery and further investigation reveal that the Classes should be expanded or otherwise modified.

50. *Numerosity:* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action against Defendant under Rules 23(b)(1)(B) and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. While the exact number and identities of other Class Members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes that there are potentially thousands of Members in the Class. Based on the number of customers who have visited Defendant's California restaurant, it is estimated that the Class is composed of more than the requisite number sustaining an adequate class action. Furthermore, even if subclasses need to be created for these consumers, it is estimated that each subclass would have hundreds of Members. The Members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims in a class action rather than in individual actions will benefit the parties and the courts.

51. *Typicality*: Plaintiff's and Class Members' claims are typical of the claims of the Members of the Class as all Members of the Class are similarly affected by Defendant's wrongful conduct, as detailed herein.

52. *Adequacy*: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Members of the Class in that they have no interests antagonistic to those of the other Members of the Class. Plaintiff has retained experienced and competent counsel.

53. *Superiority*: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Since the damages sustained by individual Class Members may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation makes it impracticable for the Members of the Class to individually seek redress for the wrongful conduct alleged herein. Furthermore, the adjudication of this controversy through a class action will avoid the potentially inconsistent and conflicting adjudications of the claims asserted herein. There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action. If Class treatment of these claims were not available, Defendant would likely unfairly receive thousands of dollars or more in improper revenue.

54. *Common Questions Predominate*: Common questions of law and fact exist as to all Members of the Class and predominate over any questions solely affecting individual Members of the Class. Among the common questions of law and fact applicable to the Class are:

- i. Whether Defendant's website, <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/>, is inaccessible to the visually impaired who use screen reading software to access internet websites;
- ii. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members have been unable to access <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/> through the use of screen reading software;
- iii. Whether the deficiencies in Defendant's website violate the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*;
- iv. Whether the deficiencies in Defendant's website violate the California Unruh Civil Rights Act, California Civil Code § 51 *et seq.*;

- 1 v. Whether, and to what extent, injunctive relief should be imposed on
2 Defendant to make <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/> readily
3 accessible to and usable by visually impaired individuals;
4 vi. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover statutory
5 damages with respect to Defendant's wrongful conduct; and
6 vii. Whether further legal and/or equitable relief should be granted by the Court
7 in this action.

8 55. The class is readily definable, and prosecution of this action as a Class action will
9 reduce the possibility of repetitious litigation. Plaintiff knows of no difficulty which will be
10 encountered in the management of this litigation which would preclude their maintenance of this
11 matter as a Class action.

12 56. The prerequisites to maintaining a class action for injunctive relief or equitable
13 relief pursuant to Rule 23(b)(2) are met, as Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds
14 generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive or equitable relief
15 with respect to the Class as a whole.

16 57. The prerequisites to maintaining a class action for injunctive relief or equitable
17 relief pursuant to Rule 23(b)(3) are met, as questions of law or fact common to the Class
18 predominate over any questions affecting only individual Members; and a class action is superior
19 to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.

20 58. The prosecution of separate actions by Members of the Class would create a risk
21 of establishing inconsistent rulings and/or incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant.
22 Additionally, individual actions may be dispositive of the
23 interests of all Members of the Class, although certain Class Members are not parties to such
24 actions.

25 59. Defendant's conduct is generally applicable to the Class as a whole and Plaintiff
26 seeks, *inter alia*, equitable remedies with respect to the Class as a whole. As such, Defendant's
27 systematic policies and practices make declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole
28 appropriate.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, 42 U.S.C. § 12181

ET SEQ.

(On Behalf of Plaintiff, the Nationwide Class, and the California Class)

60. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 59, inclusive, of this Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

61. Section 302(a) of Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, provides: “No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation.” 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

62. Under Section 302(b)(2) of Title III of the ADA, unlawful discrimination also includes, among other things: “a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations”; and “a failure to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden.” 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii)-(iii). “A public accommodation shall take those steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the public accommodation can demonstrate that taking those steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations being offered or would result in an undue burden, i.e., significant difficulty or expense.” 28 C.F.R. §

36.303(a). In order to be effective, auxiliary aids and services must be provided in accessible formats, in a timely manner, and in such a way as to protect the privacy and independence of the individual with a disability.” 28 C.F.R. § 36.303(c)(1)(ii).

63. Defendant’s location(s) is a “public accommodation” within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* Defendant generates millions of dollars in revenue from the sale of its amenities and services, privileges, advantages, and accommodations in California through its locations, related services, privileges, advantages, and accommodations, and its website, <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/>, is a service, privilege, advantage, and accommodation provided by Defendant that is inaccessible to customers who are visually impaired like Plaintiff. This inaccessibility denies visually impaired customers full and equal enjoyment of and access to the facilities and services, privileges, advantages, and accommodations that Defendant makes available to the non-disabled public. Defendant is violating the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, in that Defendant denies visually impaired customers the services, privileges, advantages, and accommodations provided by <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/>. These violations are ongoing.

64. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188 and the remedies, procedures, and rights set forth and incorporated therein, Plaintiff requests relief as set forth below.

COUNT II

VIOLATIONS OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE § 51 *ET SEQ.*

(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the California Class)

65. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 64, inclusive, of this Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

66. Defendant’s locations are “business establishments” within the meaning of the California Civil Code § 51 *et seq.* Defendant generates millions of dollars in revenue from the sale of its services in California through its locations and related services, and <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/> is a service provided by Defendant that is inaccessible to customers who are visually impaired like Plaintiff and Class Members. This inaccessibility denies

1 visually impaired customers full and equal access to Defendant's facilities and services that
2 Defendant makes available to the non-disabled public. Defendant is violating the Unruh Civil
3 Rights Act, California Civil Code § 51 *et seq.*, in that Defendant is denying visually impaired
4 customers the services provided by <https://www.tamarinrestaurant.com/>. These violations are
5 ongoing.

6 67. Defendant's actions constitute intentional discrimination against Plaintiff and
7 Class Members on the basis of a disability in violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, California
8 Civil Code § 51 *et seq.* in that: Defendant has constructed a website that is inaccessible to Plaintiff
9 and Class Members; maintains the website in this inaccessible form; and has failed to take
10 adequate actions to correct these barriers even after being notified of the discrimination that such
11 barriers cause.

12 68. Defendant is also violating the Unruh Civil Rights Act, California Civil Code § 51
13 *et seq.* in that the conduct alleged herein likewise constitutes a violation of various provisions of
14 the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* Section 51(f) of the California Civil Code provides that a
15 violation of the right of any individual under the ADA shall also constitute a violation of the
16 Unruh Civil Rights Act.

17 69. The actions of Defendant were and are in violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act,
18 California Civil Code § 51 *et seq.*, and, therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief
19 remedying the discrimination.

20 70. Plaintiff and Class Members are also entitled to statutory minimum damages
21 pursuant to California Civil Code § 52 for each and every offense.

22 71. Plaintiff and Class Members are also entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and
23 costs.

24 72. Plaintiff and Class Members are also entitled to a preliminary and permanent
25 injunction enjoining Defendant from violating the Unruh Civil Rights Act, California Civil Code
26 § 51 *et seq.*, and requiring Defendant to take the steps necessary to make
27 <https://www.tamarinrestaurant.com/> readily accessible to and usable by visually impaired
28 individuals.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all Class Members, respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment in his favor and against Defendant as follows:

- A. For an Order certifying the Nationwide Class and California Class as defined herein and appointing Plaintiff and his Counsel to represent the Nationwide Class and the California Class;
- B. A preliminary and permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(1) and (2) and section 52.1 of the California Civil Code enjoining Defendant from violating the Unruh Civil Rights Act and ADA and requiring Defendant to take the steps necessary to make <https://www.tamarinerestaurant.com/> readily accessible to and usable by visually impaired individuals;
- C. An award of statutory minimum damages of \$4,000 per offense pursuant to section 52(a) of the California Civil Code.
- D. For attorneys' fees and expenses pursuant to California Civil Code §§ 52(a), 52.1(h), and 42 U.S.C. § 12205;
- E. For pre-judgment interest to the extent permitted by law;
- F. For costs of suit; and
- G. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby demands a jury trial for all claims so triable.

Dated: May 25, 2022

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Thiago M. Coelho

Thiago M. Coelho

Binyamin I. Manoucheri

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Proposed Class